

All this does not demand that Daniel 7 be a Temple centred vision. Nor does it mean that Daniel 7 was necessarily written by a priest, since such purity consciousness and the centrality of the temple in that worldview was shared by all second Temple Jews. However, the impurity of the monsters in 7:4-8 suggests that we have here a conflict between pagan chaos and impurity against which the cult in Zion and the enthroned Yahweh sets itself in vv. 9ff. There is then a spatial and ontological shift from the sea as the locus of pagan chaos in 7:4-8 to Zion as the source of true purity in vv. 9ff. Again this purity-versus-chaos dynamic reinforces the sense that we have here is essentially a second *Temple* version of the *Chaoskampf*.

Enoch, Melchizedek and the One Like a Son of Man

Dan 7:9-15 is one of the most developed throne-theophanies in a long biblical and post-biblical tradition of that genre. In the search to understand its peculiar details a number of scholars have turned to 1 *Enoch* 14, which contains many parallels to the Danielic vision. There too there is a particular interest in the wheels of God's throne (1 *Enoch* 14:17, cf. Dan 7:9), from which there flow rivers of fire (1 *Enoch* 14:19, cf. Dan 7:10). Only here in the Hebrew Bible (v. 9) and in 1 *Enoch* 14:20 in contemporary literature is God's raiment said to be snow white. Fourthly, and with particular significance for the identification of the man in figure Dan 7:13, in 1 *Enoch* 14:8 it is the clouds which usher the human figure into God's presence. Because 1 *Enoch* 14 is now universally recognised to be a pre-Maccabean portion of the Enochic corpus, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Dan 7:9-14 is in some way dependent on that extra-canonical heavenly ascent.⁵⁹

However, the significance for the identity of the "one like a son of man" of the parallel with Enoch's cloud-ushered ascent into God's presence has remained obscure. In a later part of the Enochic tradition somebody came to the quite natural conclusion that Enoch was the "one like a son of man" of the Danielic vision (*Eth. Enoch* 37-

⁵⁹ See esp. T. F. Glasson, "The Son of Man Imagery: Enoch xiv and Daniel vii," *NTS* 23 (1976-7) 82-90.; H. S. Kvanvig, "Henoch und der Menschensohn," *ST* 38 (1984) 101-31, cf. Collins, *Daniel*, 300. That Daniel 7 is indeed a reworked scene from the Enoch material has been argued by Loren T. Stuckenbruck with respect to a passage from the Qumran Book of Giants ("The Throne-Theophany of the Book of Giants: Some New Light on the Background of Daniel 7," *forthcoming*, on 4Q30 ii 17-19).

71).⁶⁰ Yet there is nothing in Daniel 7 which points to such a conclusion and commentators have justifiably ignored the possibility that that was the author's original intention.

The literary similarity between the two texts, I believe, lies in the *tertium comparionis* that both the "one like a son of man" and Enoch are priests. In the Fall of the Watchers cycle, of which 1 *Enoch* 14 is a part, Enoch is called a "scribe of righteousness" (12:4). However, several commentators have rightly come to the conclusion that Enoch is also a priest.

Since the work of David Suter and George Nickelsburg the Fall of the Watchers cycle has been widely interpreted as a typological reference to the exogamy of priests who, like watchers in heaven, have left their domain of cultic and racial purity by marrying non-Israelite women of the land.⁶¹ On that basis, and drawing attention to the close parallels between Enoch's actions and those of Ezra, Helge Kvanvig has concluded that Enoch is the archetypal scribe and priest.⁶² This view has been developed most fully by Martha Himmelfarb. She points to numerous temple and priestly details of 1 *Enoch* 14; taking up the implications of the Suter/Nickelsburg interpretation, the watchers are priests; the tripartite heaven which Enoch enters is modelled on the tripartite division of the second Temple sanctuary; the language of Enoch's approach ("to draw near") is cultic; the Great Glory is himself dressed in priestly attire; the background to scribal and teaching activity is predominantly priestly, and Enoch's role as intercessor and his right of access to God's presence is otherwise reserved for the high priest.⁶³

As Himmelfarb and others have noted Enoch's priestly credentials were well-known and developed in later literature.⁶⁴ In *Jubilees* 4:25 Enoch makes the evening incense offering. In 2 *Enoch* Enoch's angelomorphic transformation is expressed in terms of priestly investiture (22:8-10) and the concluding chapters (69-73) "are devoted to the succession of the priesthood after Enoch's ascension,

⁶⁰ On this identification see my *Luke-Acts*, 149-153.

⁶¹ Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee," *JBL* 100 (1981) 575-600 and Suter, "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 *Enoch*," *HUCA* 50 (1979) 115-135.

⁶² H. S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man* (Neukirchener: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988) 99-103. Kvanvig thinks that the early Enoch tradition was developed by Levites who returned from Babylon in the fourth century (pp. 135-143, 157-8, 330-333).

⁶³ *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) 14-28.

⁶⁴ *Ascent to Heaven*, 25-46.

clearly implying that Enoch himself served as a priest."⁶⁵ So too in the Hekhalot text 3 *Enoch* Enoch's investiture is recognisably priestly (see. ch. 12).⁶⁶

This accumulation of priestly data is impressive and could be developed with reference to other parts of the first Enochic corpus. Lest some remain unconvinced and in order to clarify the implications for Daniel 7, it will be worth identifying more exactly the *Sitz im Leben* of the Fall of the Watchers cycle.

Like most commentators Nickelsburg, Suter and Kvanvig have all judged 1 *Enoch* 12-16 a repudiation of the allegedly corrupt Jerusalemite priesthood, which naturally implies a *sectarian* setting for this very early apocalyptic work.⁶⁷ However, whilst the exogamy typology is a convincing explanation of the myth, the conclusion that its authorship is estranged from the Jerusalemite priesthood is unnecessary. Certainly in the *Damascus Document* (2:16-19) and the *Testament of Levi* (14-16) it would be fair to conclude that the fall of the watchers is used as a sectarian rhetoric. However, the socio-religious make-up of Israelite society was very different after the Antiochene crisis (whence these two texts) by comparison with the pre-Maccabean period, whence the Book of Watchers. There is no direct and indisputable evidence for an anti-Jerusalemite sectarian group in the pre-Maccabean period.⁶⁸

Unless, that is, one include in the definition of sectarian the Samaritans, who we know *did* set themselves over against the Jerusalem hierocracy. Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar has now made the attractive suggestion that 1 *Enoch* 12-16 is originally *directed at* Samaritans, on the basis of a passage in Josephus' *Ant.* 11:306-12, which describes how Manasseh, the brother of the high priest Jaddua, married Nikaso, the daughter of Sanballat, governor of Samaria.⁶⁹ The marriage led to Manasseh's expulsion from the Jerusalem hierocracy and the founding of a temple on Mount Gerizim, which was supplied with priests and laity amongst Manasseh's supporters.

⁶⁵ *Ascent to Heaven*, 40.

⁶⁶ For Enoch/Metatron's (high) priestly characterisation in Hekhalot and rabbinic literature see 3 *Enoch* 15B:1 (OTP 1:303); *Num. Rab.* 12:12 and the *Alphabet of Metatron* (Alexander in OTP 1:265 n. 12a).

⁶⁷ Nickelsburg "Enoch, Levi, and Peter," 586; Suter, "Fallen Angel," 131, 134-5; Kvanvig, "Roots," e.g. p. 333.

⁶⁸ The sectarian understanding of apocalyptic has now come under sharp criticism from S. L. Cook, *Prophecy and Apocalypticism. The Postexilic Social Setting* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1995). Compare Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 26-8.

⁶⁹ *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End. Zechariah, the Book of Watchers and Apocalyptic* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 198-203.

Tigchelaar finds support for his proposal, not only in the closing chapters of Ezra, but also the combination of anti-Samaritan and anti-exogamy material in *Testament of Levi* 2-7 and *Jubilees* 30. If he is right, this means that in its present form the watchers cycle was composed *from the perspective* of the Jerusalem Temple Jewish community as a satire and moralistic aetiology of the behaviour of "heterodox" Samaritan Jews. In all probability it was written by a priest in the Ezra tradition whose hero, Enoch, is created in his own scribal image.

Tigchelaar's hypothesis can, I believe, be supported by two other texts. The first of these is the praise of Simon the Just in Sirach 50:1-21. This passage is framed by a polemic against "the foolish people that live in Shechem" (v. 26) and a statement of Enoch's superiority over Joseph, from whom the Samaritans claimed descent (e.g. Josephus *Ant.* 9.291; 11.341), in 49:14-15.⁷⁰ That frame interprets the hymn in praise of Simon as a glorification of the Jerusalem priesthood over against rival Samaritan hierocratic aspirations: Sirach knew that Enoch was a figure who could be used against rival Samaritan claims.

Secondly, David Bryan has now demonstrated that in a pre-Maccabean "*Original Testament of Naphtali*" underlying both the *Testament of Naphtali* and the *Hebrew Testament of Naphtali* visionary material is used as a Jerusalem based polemic against Samaritans who are represented by Joseph.⁷¹ In that case it is highly significant that in the *Testament of Naphtali* this polemic (chs. 5-6) immediately follows a reference to the admonition "in the writing of the holy Enoch" (4:1) and the lesson to be learnt from "the Watchers [who] departed from nature's order" (3:5).

All this has two important results: 1 *Enoch* 12-17 is best understood and was well known as a mythological satire against Samaritans. As such it is a mainstream Jerusalem Temple text.⁷² In this context Enoch provides ideological support for the Jerusalem priesthood, over against other priestly communities. Just as 1 *Enoch* 14 had recourse to the ascent to heaven of the archetypal priest during the threat posed by the Samaritan schism *within* the Jewish community, so too Daniel 7 created the vision of a priestly ascent to heaven during, what the author perceived to be a threat *from without* the Jewish community.

Besides the Samaritan exogamy allegory, the other widely acknowledged socio-religious referent in the Fall of the Watchers

⁷⁰ On the opposition between Enoch and Joseph in this passage see my *Luke-Acts*, 148-9.

⁷¹ *Cosmos*, 188-212.

⁷² Cf. Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old*, 203.

myth is the Day of Atonement ritual.⁷³ In the first instance this is evident in the similarity of the names of one of the two archangelic apostates (Azazel: *1 Enoch* 9:6; 10:4 etc..) and the destination of one of the two goats during the Day of Atonement ritual (Lev 16:8, 10, 26). As later Christian and Jewish texts make clear, the binding and detention of the fallen watchers (*1 Enoch* 10) was evidently modelled on the scapegoat's departure and death in the wilderness.⁷⁴ In that case it is highly significant that Enoch's heavenly ascent looks most like the high priest's annual visit to the holy of holies on the Day of Atonement. Only on that occasion does he come as close to God's presence as does Enoch.⁷⁵ During the Samaritan crisis, when priestly exogamy had defiled sacred space, it would be quite natural for the rite of purgation in Leviticus 16 to be used as the means by which such a archetypal sin was removed. So, once again, we find strong support for the conclusion that not only is the "one like a son of man" a priest, but his movement into God's presence surrounded by clouds is specifically parallel to another visionary text in which a high priestly figure's entry into the heavenly holy of holies is related to that of the annual Day of Atonement ceremony.

The same conclusion is reached if we reflect on the possible parallel to Dan 7:13 in the Melchizedek pseudepigraphon from Qumran (11QMelch). Many commentators have seized on this text, which predicates **אלהים** of Melchizedek (line 10).⁷⁶ Whilst this Melchizedek is normally regarded as a suprahuman angelic figure, a simultaneous identification with the earthly king-priest in Genesis 14 and Psalm 110 should not be ruled out.⁷⁷ Most important for our purposes is the fact that the eschatological appearance of this divine judge Melchizedek is described as the Day of Atonement on the tenth Jubilee (line 7, cf. line 2).

This Jubilee theology, which is inextricable from the Day of Atonement festival - the Jubilee being set for the tenth of Tishri (Lev 25:9) - was evidently familiar to the Danielic tradition. Even though Daniel 9 was certainly written after Daniel 7, it is not insignificant

⁷³ Kvanvig, *Roots*, 100, 102.

⁷⁴ For the texts see L. L. Grabbe, "The Scapegoat Ritual: A Study in Early Jewish Interpretation," *JSJ* 18 (1987) 152-67.

⁷⁵ Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 18 has noted the similarity between God's garment in *1 Enoch* 14 and that of the high priest during the Yom Kippur ritual.

⁷⁶ E.g. Goldingay, *Daniel*, 172; Collins, *Daniel*, 293.

⁷⁷ See my *Luke-Acts*, 155, 196-7. Compare the use of **אלהים** for Moses (from Exod 7:1) in 4Q374 2 ii 6, on which see my "4Q374: A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: The Deification of Moses and Early Christology" *DSD* 3 (1996) 236-252.

that there the interpretation of Jer 25:11-12; 29:10 is given an interpretation in terms of ten Jubilees (490 years). The echoes of an eschatological Day of Atonement that this interpretation might sound chime in very well with the vision in Dan 7:9-14 if that too envisages a similar eschatological festival.⁷⁸

The Day of Atonement as the Text's Life Setting: A Proposal

Thus far there is much to suggest that Daniel 7 not only belongs in a cultic context, but that it has in mind in particular the New Year festival. John Day has assumed the most relevant festival is Tabernacles. However, the New Year was divided in the second Temple period into three separate festivals - Rosh Hashanah, the Day of Atonement and Tabernacles. Whilst there was no doubt a creative interplay between the meaning of each it might be helpful to clarify whether one of these three in particular was in the author's mind.

Lacocque's conclusion that the Temple context best explained the vision was reached not simply from the cultic focus of the Antiochene reforms but the very specific defilement caused by the appointment of Jason as the high priest after the assassination of Onias III (Dan 9:26): this "new stain ... could only be erased by the coming of the ultimate high priest".⁷⁹ This insight that the coming of the one like a son of man is an act which would remove the impurity which has contaminated sacred space is perceptive and can now be supported by David Bryan's work on the impurity of the *Mischwesen*. Within the Pentateuchal laws governing the cult the means by which impurity which has contaminated the Temple is removed is the rite of purgation prescribed for the Day of Atonement in Leviticus 16.

We have already seen that the parallel to 1 Enoch 14 suggests Daniel 7 has a Day of Atonement focus. It is to a detailed consideration of this possibility that we now turn.

The Son of Man, the Day of Atonement and the Pharisees and Sadducees

Obviously the strongest point of connection between Dan 7:9-14 and the Day of Atonement is the image of God's appearance "on

⁷⁸ The Day of Atonement echo in the Jubilee motif has been noted by Lacocque, *Book of Daniel*, 192, in commenting on the phrase לְכַפֵּר עוֹן at 9:24. Note also the division of history into Jubilees in 4QPseudo-Daniel (4Q243-5) line 14.

⁷⁹ Lacocque, *Book of Daniel*, 125.

earth" and the movement of both the man-figure and the high priest into his presence. That this New Year festival is specifically in mind is confirmed, I believe, by the clouds motif.

As J. A. Emerton rightly pointed out the association of the man-figure with the clouds means he receives a feature of nature which is otherwise only ever associated with God himself in the biblical tradition.⁸⁰ In some instances the biblical cloud theophany is of an apparently non-cultic, historical nature (e.g. Ps 19:1; Ezek 1:4). We are reminded of its role at the giving of the law in the Sinaitic revelation and the cloud leading the people in the wilderness which bears God's presence. However, in another set of texts the cloud is associated with God's presence in the Temple (e.g. 1 Kgs 8:11) and the Tabernacle (e.g. Exod 40:34-38; Num 9:15-22).

In the Day of Atonement text, Leviticus 16, it is stated that God "appears in the cloud above the mercy seat" (v. 2). We are reminded of the cloud of glory which descends upon the Tabernacle. In the context of Leviticus 16 we are probably meant to think of the "cloud of incense" which comes from the high priest's censer rising above the ark (v. 13).⁸¹ Do we need to choose between these two?

In his recent monograph on *Incense in the Ancient Cult* Kjeld Nielsen has argued that we should hold together cultic descriptions of incense burning and the historical accounts of God appearing, for example at Sinai, in a cloud. Though not wishing to deny some pre-cultic historical or mythological tradition, he sees that tradition re-enacted in the cult through the use of incense to create a cloud.⁸² This means that, whenever obviously associated with the divine presence, the use of incense in the cult would remind the participant of the theophanic cloud. In a visionary text, like Daniel 7 where there is good reason to see a cultic framework, this symbolism is quite naturally reversed: clouds are the cosmological equivalent of the Temple's incense smoke. In Leviticus 16 the cloud represents or shields the presence of God, so what are we to make of its association with a putative high priestly "son of man"?

There was, according to rabbinic texts, a heated debate between Pharisees and Sadducees over the interpretation and application of the incense instructions in Leviticus 16. The Sadducees believed that the incense should be applied to the coals at the altar in the courtyard, which means that when the high priest enters the

⁸⁰ Emerton, "Origin," 232.

⁸¹ So, e.g., J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16* (New York: Doubleday, 1991) 1014-5. For the use of cloud language with respect to incense see e.g. Ezek 8:11; Sirach 50:6.

⁸² (Leiden: Brill, 1986) 82ff.

sanctuary he is already accompanied by clouds of incense. The Pharisees vehemently rejected this interpretation and insisted that the high priest only place the incense upon the coals once inside the holy of holies.⁸³

The relevant texts do not themselves explain why this issue was such a cause of contention and modern commentators have been hard pressed to supply a persuasive rationale.⁸⁴ It might be that the Sadducees were concerned lest the high priest enter the holy of holies unprotected from an unmediated vision of the deity or from demonic attack. But then it is difficult to see why the Pharisees did not share that concern. Hitherto little light has been shed on this argument from what else is known about post-biblical party strife and the issues at stake between the Pharisees and Sadducees.

It is frequently assumed that the scriptural text is clearly in support of the Pharisaic position.⁸⁵ However, LeMoyne has rightly noted that the matter is not clear cut and the Pharisees may not actually have the literal text squarely on their side.⁸⁶ If one reads the Hebrew (or LXX) of Lev 16:12-13 and assumes that it is once inside the holy of holies that Aaron is to place the incense upon the fire (so the Pharisees) then these verses present two problems. First, v. 12 literally reads, "And he shall take a censer full of coals of fire *from* the altar, *from before* the LORD (מִלִּפְנֵי יְהוָה)". The second prepositional suffix מֵן is redundant and reads a little oddly.⁸⁷ Secondly, v. 12b refers to the filling of both hands (dual: הִפְנֵי) with incense: it strains logistical practicalities to imagine the high priest with two hands full of incense carrying at the same time a censer full of fire.⁸⁸

⁸³ See *t. Yoma* 1:8, 181; *b. Yoma* 19b; 53a; *y. Yoma* 1:5, 39a; *Sipra* Lev 16:13 (68a).

⁸⁴ See e.g. J. Z. Lauterbach, "A Significant Controversy between the Sadducees and the Pharisees," *HUCA* 4 (1927) 173-205; J. LeMoyne, *Les Sadducéens*, (Paris: Lecoffre, 1972) 249-263; Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1028-31; E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE - 66 CE* (London: SCM, 1992) 335, 395-7, 466 (where Sanders confuses the Sadducean with the Pharisaic position), 469.

⁸⁵ Lauterbach, "Controversy," 173-4; Milgrom, "Leviticus," 1028; Sanders, *Judaism*, 335.

⁸⁶ LeMoyne, *Sadducéens*, 249-50, 258, 262. R. Leszynsky, "Die Sadduzäer," (Berlin: Mayer & Müller, 1912) 61 thinks the biblical texts supports the Sadducees.

⁸⁷ Milgrom's suggestions, *Leviticus*, 1025, do not fully alleviate the problem. He points out that "had the text read *lipnê*, the clauses might have been misread "from atop the altar to the presence of the Lord."" That would have suited the Pharisees very well.

⁸⁸ Leszynsky, *Sadduzäer*, 62. The Mishnah (*Yoma* 5:1) has to introduce a ladle for the incense where there is none mentioned in the biblical text.

With the Sadducean interpretation both these difficulties at once disappear. The Sadducees, it would appear, read verse 13 not as consecutive with v. 12c ("... and he shall bring it inside the curtain *and put the incense....*" (so NRSV)), but as a resumption of v. 12ab: "And he shall take a censer full of coals of fire from the altar, *from before the LORD*, (and he shall bring it inside the curtain). And he shall [also] put the incense on the fire *before the LORD*." The redundant "from (before the LORD)" in v. 12a (cf. v. 18) is deliberately included to be picked up in v. 13 where it alerts the reader to the fact that obtaining the coals and placing the burning of the incense both occur at the same place.⁸⁹ Elsewhere the phrase "before the LORD" quite clearly means the altar of the forecourt (e.g. Lev 1:5; 4:4).⁹⁰ No juggling act is intended: Aaron is to carry from the altar the incense upon the coals in the one censer into the inner sanctuary. Admittedly, the ritual prescription could have been less convoluted, but the Sadducees need not be embarrassed by the biblical text.⁹¹

As J. Z. Lauterbach wisely pointed out, "[h]ad the older practice been like the one advocated by their party or had there been an oral tradition favouring their opinion, the Pharisaic teachers certainly would have mentioned it." But in the extant accounts they do not. "It is therefore safe to assume... that in this case the Sadducees followed the traditional time-honoured practice, while the Pharisees were not advocates of an old oral tradition... but the innovators".⁹²

This all suggests the Pharisaic hermeneutic had an ulterior motive. If the Pharisees, for whom eschatology was far more important than it was for the Sadducees, cherished Daniel 7 in the belief that God was going to send a future high priestly figure who would fulfil the action described in v. 13, then they would quite understandably resist Sadducean officiation which appeared to fulfil that passage. The Sadducee/Pharisee separation was evidently occasioned by disagreements over Hasmonean claims to the power of

⁸⁹ For resumption elsewhere in Leviticus 16 compare v. 11a with v. 6.

⁹⁰ See esp. Num 16:17 where it is assumed that incense is to be placed on the coals according to the Sadducean practice.

⁹¹ The Sadducean desire to have the high priest surrounded by the incense is reminiscent of Moses' experience according to Exod 24:18. It may also have been shared by the Essenes if the fragmentary *Tongues of Fire* text (1Q29; 4Q376) refers to the high priest coming forth with the cloud from the sanctuary, (1Q29 1 3; 4Q376 1 ii 1). On the other side of 4Q376 (4Q377) there is a description of Moses covered by the cloud speaking as God's mouth piece "as though he were an angel" (line 11).

⁹² "Controversy," 176. According to LeMoyné, (*Sadducéens*, 259) Lauterbach's judgement is followed by "la plupart des auteurs", himself included (pp. 259-60).

both high priesthood and kingship. In that context the Pharisees did not, as did the Sadducees, accept the realised eschatology of the Hasmonean priest-kings: they did not, I suggest, accept that any of the Hasmoneans fulfilled Dan 7:13. And during the closing decades of the second Temple period, when the Hasmoneans had all but disappeared from the political scene, they continued to insist, against any Sadducean pretensions to the contrary, that the Day of Atonement ritual could not be conducted such that it might look like a fulfilment of Daniel 7. They awaited some eschatological figure who would fulfil what the older Day of Atonement ideology believed was fulfilled by the high priest during that festival.

Whether or not the Sadducees desired consciously to fulfil Dan 7:13 remains to be seen. At any rate there is support for our supposition that they wished to continue the traditional manner of the liturgy. Already in the third century B.C. the Book of Watchers provided a model for the ideal priest who would ascend to the holy of holies surrounded by clouds. In Sirach, a book which is often related to Sadduceanism, and which climaxes, as we have already seen, with a description of the ideal high priest who is related closely to Enoch (49:14ff), we also have evidence of the pre-Maccabean dating of the Sadducee's incense policy. There, in ch. 50 v. 6, Simon ben Onias is said to be "like the morning star among the clouds" as he left the sanctuary. Though his *entry* is not described, the author clearly wants to associate a cloud, not simply with the presence of God, but with the person of the high priest. That there is an association specifically with the *incense* cloud may be corroborated by v. 9 where Simon is "like fire and incense in the censer". What is more, the comparison between Simon and the morning star places his office quite firmly in the tradition of the angelomorphic humanity which, we have suggested, explains the otherwise divergent evidence for the identity of the "one like a son of man" in Dan 7:13.

My proposal can be corroborated by a detail of the rabbinic records concerning the disagreement. According to the Mishnah on the eve of the Day of Atonement a Sadducean high priest would have read to him various scriptures: "And from what did they read before him? Out of Job and Ezra and Chronicles. Zechariah b. Kabutal says: "Many times I read before him out of Daniel" (*m. Yoma* 1:6)." We are not told why these books were read. It is normally suggested that the reading of Daniel is due to the controversy surrounding the belief in the resurrection for which the Pharisees could find support in Dan

12:1-3.⁹³ That is possible and, given the connection between an angelomorphic high priest representing the righteous who therefore experience what he experiences, this is not incompatible with my interpretation. However, I suggest, the Sadducean high priest was read Daniel, and particularly chapter 7, so that he knew why he was not to light the incense until he was in the holy of holies. Similarly, the reading of Ezra may have had in mind Ezra 2:63 which looks forward to an eschatological high priest (cf. Neh 7:65).

We are thus led to the conclusion that Dan 7:9-14 describes the eschatological Day of Atonement (perhaps a Jubilee) when the true high priest will come to the Ancient of Days surrounded by clouds of incense. In this very specific context it is worth noting ample evidence that on this day the high priest was angelomorphic. So, for example, in a tradition shared by Philo and the rabbis "כל אדם לא יהיה באהל מועד בבאו" (Lev 16:17) is interpreted to mean that there is no mortal man in the holy of holies on the high priest's entry because the latter is actually an angel at this point.⁹⁴ Philo takes the linen garments of this ritual to be symbolic of an immortal identity (*De Somnis* 1:216-7). Jacob Milgrom has now concluded that it was the original intention of the biblical text for the high priest's simple attire to symbolise an angelic identity pertinent to his access to the heavenly assembly.⁹⁵

The High Priest, Baal and the *Chaoskampf*

Our discussion thus far has, I believe, on the basis of the text's foreground - the Temple cult - and some considerations of the more immediate background (e.g. *1 Enoch* 14), established sufficient grounds for a high priestly man-figure in Dan 7:13. Because of the importance of the Baal allusions it is incumbent upon us to say something about the high priest and the *Chaoskampf*. That subject would merit extensive treatment in its own right. Given the confines of this study I can only flag up work in progress and give five reasons why I believe that prior to Daniel 7 the high priest had already taken on an identity mimicking that of Baal.

(1) First, whilst Mosca is right to draw attention to the way in which, for example in Ps 89, Baal motifs are transferred to the pre-

⁹³ See e.g. LeMoyné, *Sadducéens*, 261-2.

⁹⁴ *Lev. Rab.* 21:12. Philo: *Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres* 84; *De Somnis* 2:188-89; 2:231. See my *Luke-Acts*, 126.

⁹⁵ *Leviticus*, 1016.

exilic king, in the post-exilic period the prerogatives of kingship are transferred to priesthood. *A priori*, then, there is the possibility that the role of the king in the cult with respect to his authority over the mythical forces of chaos should be transferred to the role of the high priest within the same sphere.

(2) Secondly, P. J. Kearney has argued that in Exod 25-31 the sevenfold division in the instructions for the building of the Tabernacle corresponds to the seven days of creation in the P account of Genesis 1.⁹⁶ This correspondence is transparent for the third and seventh sections where the building of the bronze laver (30:17-21: the "sea" of 1 Kgs 7:23) and the injunction to keep the Sabbath (31:12-17) correspond perfectly to the third and seventh days of creation in Gen 1:9-10; 2:2-3. Closer examination would, I believe, reveal a clear correlation between each of the other five sections and P's day's of creation.⁹⁷ The cumulative effect of this intratextuality is to place cosmogony in the context of liturgy and to define the Tabernacle as a microcosm of the universe.

For our purposes Kearney's suggestion is significant because it places the description of Aaron's garments and his ordination (Exod 28-29) in parallelism with the first day of creation (Gen 1:1-5) where, however muted, there are echoes of God's victory over the forces of chaos in ancient Near Eastern cosmogonies.⁹⁸ Kearney himself saw a parallelism between God creating light (Gen 1:3-5) and Aaron tending the Tabernacle menorah, to which reference is made in Exod 27:20-21 and 30:7-8 - an *inclusio* around Exodus 28-9.⁹⁹ That, here, Aaron plays the role within the cult that God plays within creation is important because, as John Day has noted with specific reference to Gen 1:3-5, in the ancient Near East the defeat of the forces of chaos is

⁹⁶ "Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Exodus 25-40," ZAW 89 (1977) 375-87. Each section begins "And the LORD spoke to Moses, saying..." (Exod 25:1; 30:11; 30:17; 30:22; 30:34; 31:1; 31:12).

⁹⁷ Kearney has been partially taken up by, e.g., M. Weinfeld, "Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement of the Lord, The Problem of the *Sitz-im-Leben* of Gen. 1:1-2:3," *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles* (ed. A. Caquot and M. Delcor; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981) 501-11, 502 n. 5, 507; Levenson, *Creation*, 82-3, though his central thesis has not received the attention it deserves. Weinfeld's own discussion (506-7) points to the correspondence between the luminaries of the fourth day of creation (Gen 1:14-19) and the consecration of Aaron's sons in God's fourth speech (Exod 30:22-33).

⁹⁸ For those echoes see Day, *God's Conflict*, 49-3.

⁹⁹ "Creation and Liturgy," 375. This relationship between Aaron, God and the creation of light can be correlated with Zech 2:8; 3:9; 4:14.

commonly associated with the dawn, light in general and the sun god or goddess.¹⁰⁰

Similar conclusions are reached if we examine the details of Exodus 28-9 in their ancient Near Eastern history-of-religions context:

(3) The ephod (Exod 28:4f) has puzzled commentators. There is now general agreement that originally and in other contexts the biblical ephod was a garment that covered a statue of a god.¹⁰¹ As such it was a biblical example of a widespread interest in the precious garments of the gods.¹⁰² This symbolism is then assumed to have been lost when in P Aaron is given an ephod.

However, there are good reasons to think the Aaronic ephod retained its divine garment symbolism. In the post-biblical period Jewish tradition continues to interpret the ephod's symbolism in terms of divine clothing.¹⁰³ In the context of the cosmic symbolism of the Tabernacle it would make excellent sense to have Aaron wear such divine costume: "... not only do different parts of the Temple and its objects represent the heavenly abode, but even the priests ... represent the divine retinue, i.e. the angels" and so the high priest represents the presence of God Himself.¹⁰⁴

Outside the Hebrew Bible there are several instances of a word apparently cognate with the biblical אֶפֶוד. In one of these the usage points to this garment being worn by the god victorious in the *Chaoskampf*. In a well-known passage from the Ugaritic Baal epic an 'ipd is worn by Baal when he slays Leviathan.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁰ Day, *God's Conflict*, 102, 121-2. See e.g. Ps 46:6; Isa 14:12f; 17:14; Job 26:12-13; Hab 3:11 and esp. Ps 110:7 of the priest-king.

¹⁰¹ See esp. Judg 17:5; 18:14-20; Hos 3:4, cf. 2 Kgs 23:7: ABD 2:550 "Ephod"; HALAT 1:77.

¹⁰² See esp. A. L. Oppenheim, "The Golden Garments of the Gods," *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University* 8 (1949) 172-193.

¹⁰³ In *Gen. Rab.* 38:8 the high priest wears God's garments (cf. *y. Yoma* 7:3, 44b; *Lev. Rab.* 21:11). In 4QShirShabb (4Q405 23 ii 5; 11QShirShabb 8-7 6) the ephodim are worn by the angelic priests of the heavenly realm. See also Josephus *Ant.* 3:180 in context, Aristeas 99, Rev 1:13-16 and the texts (below) which deal with the breastplate.

¹⁰⁴ Extending the logic of Weinfeld's conclusion: "Sabbath, Temple," 506.

¹⁰⁵ CTA 5.I.1-5 according to the translation of J. C. de Moor, *An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit* (Leiden: Brill, 1988) 69-70. The translation of the difficult lines 4-5 has been disputed (by e.g. J. A. Emerton, "A difficult part of Mot's message to Baal in the Ugaritic texts," in *AJBA* 2 (1972) 50-71). However, the older view that we have in the 'ipd a garment is confirmed by the sense of this word at CTA 5.V.2-4, 24.

Although you [Baal] defeated Lotanu, the fleeing serpent,
 destroyed the coiling serpent,
 the Tyrant with the seven heads,
 you were uncovered, the heaven came loose like the
 girdle of your cloak ('ipdk)!

The first two lines of this text are remarkably close to Isa 27:1 and they are frequently cited in the discussion of Daniel 7.¹⁰⁶ However, hitherto no notice has been taken of the reference in line 5 to an Ugaritic ephod and the implications this might have for Dan 7:13.

(4) Fourthly, the stones on the high priest's breastplate have several very specific and important symbolic functions. In the first place the parallels to Ezek 28:12ff and the Greek Addition to Esther D (15:6) clearly demonstrate that these are specifically attached to divine kingship.¹⁰⁷

In the second place there are three considerations which point to the very specific symbolism of these stones as the property of the god or divine representative who has overcome the forces of chaos. First, in the cuneiform text *Lugal-e* the god Ninurta(/ Ningirsu), with whom Marduk is elsewhere identified, and who in this text defeats the forces of chaos in the mountains, takes as his prize a collection of stones similar in number and configuration to those of the high priest's breast plate (esp. lines 498-545). Ninurta's stones are then set up in the cult as an object of worship (542-5).¹⁰⁸ Secondly, this taking of stones as the spoil of the *Chaoskampf* reminds us of the twelve stones taken from the river Jordan in Joshua 4. There too the stones are taken in the context of an event reminiscent of the defeat of the sea/river to be set up in the cult at Gilgal. Thirdly, almost a century ago W. Muss-Arnolt had good cause to compare the high priest's stones with the Tablet of Destinies, which are taken by Marduk from the vanquished Qingu to be worn during the god's ordering of the

¹⁰⁶ See e.g. Ferch, *Son of Man*, 62; Collins, *Daniel*, 287

¹⁰⁷ Compare Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* 25:10-26:15 where the stones are related to those covering Amorite idols. Eschatologically, they will be set above the two cherubim over the ark (26:12).

¹⁰⁸ In particular, the light-giving Hematite (the Truth stone) and Alabaster (498-523) are reminiscent of the Urim and Thummim, the δῆλωσις and ἀλήθεια. For the *editio princeps* see J. van Dijk, *LUGAL UD ME-LÁM-bi NIR GÁL* (Leiden: Brill, 1983). An English translation is available in T. Jacobsen, *The Harps that Once.... : Sumerian Poetry in Translation* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987) 260-262.

cosmos (*Enuma Elish* 4:121-2).¹⁰⁹ Both the Tablet of Destinies and Aaron's breastplate are worn over the breast. Support for Muss-Arnolt's hypothesis is perhaps provided by Ezek 28:13 where, in the context of a description of the breastplate's stones, the otherwise obscure תִּפְיָת is cognate with the Tablet (*tup*) of Destinies.¹¹⁰

(5) Finally, confirmation for the view that Aaron wears the garments of the God victorious in the *Chaoskampf* is provided by a remarkable passage in Josephus' *Antiquities* Book 3. In his extended account of the tabernacle and the priestly clothing Josephus comes to describe the sash with which the priests' robe is girded to the upper body:

... they gird [the robe] at the breast, winding to a little above the armpits the sash, which is of a breadth of about four fingers and has an open texture giving it the appearance of a serpent's skin. Therein are interwoven flowers of divers hues, of crimson and purple, blue and fine linen, but the warp is purely of fine linen. Having taken the end of the twisting across the breast and winding it around again,¹¹¹ it is tied and then hangs at length, sweeping to the ankles, that is so long as the priest has no task in hand, for so its beauty is displayed to the beholders' advantage; but when it behoves him to attend to the sacrifices and perform his ministry, in order that the movements of the sash may not impede his actions, he throws it back over his left shoulder. Moses gave it the name of ὀβανήθ but we have learnt from the Babylonians to call it ἐμίαν, for so it is designated among them (3:154-6).

Why is the sash likened to a serpent (ὄφις) and does this have anything to do with Leviathan? The sash is referred to with the language of "twisting" (ἐλίξ), which is otherwise so characteristic of a snake's skin. This language is also reminiscent of that used of the "twisting" serpent in Isa 27:1-2 and the parallel passage in the Baal cycle (CTA 5.I.1-3) where, as we have seen there is a reference to an

¹⁰⁹ "The Urim and Thummim. A Suggestion as to Their Original Nature and Significance," *AJS* 16 (1900) 211-219, where he sets out some of the similarities.

¹¹⁰ For this explanation of Ezekiel's expression see J. Weill, "Les mots תִּפְיָת תִּפְיָת dans la complainte d'Ezékiel sur le roi de Tyre (28:11-19)," *REJ* 42 (1901) 7-13.

¹¹¹ I have departed from the Loeb translation ("wound a first time at the breast, after passing round it once again"), which obscures the fact that the sash itself is described as possessing "twisting" (λαβοῦσα τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ἐλίξεως κατὰ στέρον).

ephod. A little further on Josephus says of the High Priest in particular that

.... by the sash, wherewith he encompassed [the robe] he (i.e. Moses) signified the ocean, which holds the whole in its embrace (3:185).

Clearly this suggests that it is not a land serpent that is meant, but a sea serpent: the sash represents both Yam or Tiamat and their monster Leviathan (Lotan) or Qingu. That this symbolic understanding goes back far into Israel's history is suggested by a likely connection with the etymology of the name Leviathan (לִיָּתָן). It is commonly assumed that this is related to the Hebrew noun לִיָּה, which in Prov 1:9 & 4:9 is some kind of wreath or garland, not unlike our priest's sash.¹¹² In turn it is supposed that both nouns are derived from a hypothetical root לִיָּה which would mean "to turn, twist, wind".¹¹³ If some connection between this mythical beast and a sash embroidered in its image does in fact go back some way in biblical tradition this might explain the linguistic discrepancy between the biblical *lwytn* and the alternative spelling of the same creature's name in CTA 5.I.1 where its consonants are *ltn*: by the period of biblical transmission, if not before, this monster had become associated with a cultic item of symbolic dress, and the precise form of its name affected accordingly.

The express purpose of the sash's sea/chaos monster symbolism would require further examination. However, at this juncture there should be no doubt that the high priest wears a *vanquished* Leviathan: the sash hanging at his side evokes the image of a limp and defeated serpent in the hand of its conqueror.¹¹⁴

With these five points there is, I submit, good evidence that, within the cult at least, the high priest takes on the some of God's identity in the victory over the forces of chaos. Needless to say, whilst it would be over hasty to use the word "ditheism" of this material,

¹¹² BDB 531, cf. the לִיָּה (sing. לִיָּה) which decorate the stands of the basin in Solomon's temple, (1 Kgs 7: 29, 30, 36). Is it a mere coincidence that this basin was called "the Sea"?

¹¹³ See most recently John Emerton's discussion: "Leviathan and *Ltn*: The Vocalization of the Ugaritic Word for the Dragon," VT 32 (1982) 327-31.

¹¹⁴ It is worth comparing cylinder seal images of the god victorious in the Chaoskampf, where the god holds in his hand the limp serpent. See e.g. E. Williams-Forte, "The Snake and the Tree in the Iconography and Texts of Syria during the Bronze Age," *Ancient Seals and the Bible* (ed. L. Gorelick and E. Williams-Forte; Malibu, CA: Undena, 1983) 18-43, 39 (figs. 1, 2 & 4) for examples.

the pattern is close to that of the relationship between the Ancient of Days and the 'one like a son of man' in Daniel 7.

Of course all this requires much fuller investigation: there is enough material here for an extensive history-of-religions examination of the theology of priesthood in the Hebrew Bible in its own right. Within the constraints of the present context I simply offer these *prolegomena* to a fuller investigation in the belief that they provide the solution to the problem posed by the mythological imagery in Dan 7:13.

The High Priestly Son of Man in The New Testament

Besides the Enochic Son of Man in the Similitudes we would, I believe, find in a thoroughgoing reappraisal of the New Testament Son of Man material some significant support for my proposed rereading of Daniel 7. Passages such as Mark 2:10; 6:5; 10:45 where the Son of Man is specifically related to cultic concerns now come into clearer focus. In an earlier study I have drawn attention to the parallelism between the Son of Man logion in Luke 17:24-5 (cf. Matt 24:27) and a portion of the Qumran Aramaic Levi material which describes the eschatological high priest.¹¹⁵

In the absence of a detailed discussion attention should, in particular, be drawn to three New Testament passages. In Rev 1:13 the risen Christ is not only angelomorphic, he is also dressed in the high priest's garb.¹¹⁶ In the final conflict between Jesus and the authorities, where Jesus openly reveals his claim to be the fulfilment of Dan 7:13 (Mark 14:62), the clash between his own claim to be the true, eschatological high priest and the self-perception of Caiaphas brings the nature of this otherwise puzzling passage into relief. Given the evidently well-known tradition that the Son of Man was to come "as the Ancient of Days" (OG, cf. Rev 1:13-16 and later *Two Powers* debates) and those texts where it is the (true) high priest who receives the people's worship, the charge of blasphemy in response to Jesus' claim to be the Son of Man now begins to make sense.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁵ *Luke-Acts*, 196, 232-3.

¹¹⁶ See T. Holtz, *Die Christologie der Apokalypse des Johannes* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962) 118-121.

¹¹⁷ For the worship of the high priest see Hecataeus of Abdera (Diodorus Siculus *Bibliotheca Historica* 40.3.4-7) and Josephus *Ant.* 11:331 (see my *Luke-Acts*, 120-125). Both the worship of Adam in *Life of Adam and Eve* 12-16 (*Luke-Acts*, 142 n. 190) and the Enochic Son of Man in *Eth. Enoch* 48:5; 62:9 should now be given a high priestly context. To these texts should probably be added the *hymn in praise*

Thirdly, the Son of Man title is particularly prominent during the discussion of Jesus' identity at Caesarea Phillipi (Mark 8:27-9:13). A good case could be made for the transfiguration as a revelation of Jesus as the true high priest - the Son of Man. Peter's confusion over the booths suggests we are meant to think of the New Year festivals. The emphasis on self-denial in Jesus' teaching (Mark 8:34) fits well with the injunction in Lev 16:29 to "deny yourselves" on the Day of Atonement and these points of correspondence are developed in Matthew's version where the binding of the watchers and the role of Peter as the new stone of foundation (Shetiyah, cf. *m. Yoma* 5:2) are included (Matt 16:18-19).¹¹⁸

of Simon in Sirach 50. As for the charge of blasphemy (cf. Luke 12:10) the argument between the Pharisees and Sadducees concerning the respect due to John Hyrcanus (Josephus *Ant.* 13:294) probably has some significance. There it is likely that the Sadducees were dependent upon a conflation of Exod 22:28 (You shall not revile God (אלהים)) or curse a leader of your people) and Lev 24:13-16 (treatment of blasphemy as a capital offence) in their demand for a death penalty for the Eleazar, the Pharisee who had slandered the high priest Hyrcanus.

¹¹⁸ The work of H. Riesenfeld, *Jésus transfiguré: L'Arrière-plan du récit évangélique de la transfiguration de Notre-Seigneur* (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1947) and Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter," on this material has not received the attention it deserves.